



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/924,582 | 08/09/2001 | Miska Hannuksela | 367.40448X00 | 2987 | |
| 20457 | 7590 04/15/2005 | | EXAMINER | | |
| ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP | | | PHILIPPE | PHILIPPE, GIMS S | |
| SUITE 1800 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| ARLINGTO | N, VA 22209-3873 | | 2613 | | |

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| , | 09/924,582 | HANNUKSELA, MISKA | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Gims S Philippe | 2613 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | , · · · | orrespondence address | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 October 2004</u> . | | | | | | |
| 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This | ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E. | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9,12,13 and 15</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9,12,13 and 15</u> is/are rejected. | • | | | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa | aminer. Note the attached Office | Action or form PTO-152. | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign | priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a) | -(d) or (f). | | | | |
| a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: | | | | | | |
| 1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview Summary (| (PTO-413) | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa | te atent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/9/01 3/13/03, 4/11 (02) | 6) Other: | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/924,582 Page 2

Art Unit: 2613

DETAILED ACTION

This is a first office action in response to a Restriction Requirement mailed on October

5th 2004. The applicant elected with traverse the claims drawn to a video encoder (i.e.,

group I claims 1-9). This election is considered to be final by the examiner.

Note: The preliminary amendment, filed with the original application with respect to

claims 12 and 13, has been acknowledged.

Claim Objections

1. Claim 15 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because

a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only--, and/or, -

- cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim--.. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Accordingly, the claim has not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this

title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 2613

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ueda (US Patent no. 6591014).

Regarding claims 1-2, 6-7 and 9, Ueda discloses the same apparatus and method of encoding a video signal representing a sequence of pictures, the method comprising encoding at least part of a first picture of the sequence without reference to another picture of the sequence (See Ueda col. 2, lines 45-48, and col. 4, lines 61-62) and encoding said at least part of the first picture with reference to another picture of the sequence to produce a corresponding temporally predicted picture (See Ueda col. 2, lines 50-51, col. 4, lines 62-64).

As per claims 3-5, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejection of claim 1. In addition, Ueda further discloses encoding part of the first picture is encoded with reference to another picture occurring in the sequence temporally prior to the first picture (See col. 2, lines 4-18), and wherein the first picture or part thereof is

Art Unit: 2613

encoded with reference to another picture occurring in the sequence temporally after the first picture (See Ueda col. 4, lines 60-67, col. 5, lines 1-5)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claim 8, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda (US Patent no. 6591014) in view of Nakaya et al. (US Patent no. 6028631).

Regarding claims 8, 12, and 13, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejection of claims 6 and 7.

It is noted that Ueda is silent about a multimedia system and a portable electronic device including a video encoder.

Nakaya et al. discloses a multimedia system and a portable electronic device including a video encoder (See Nakaya col. 4, lines 53-67, and col. 5, lines 1-15).

Therefore, it is considered obvious that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would recognize the advantage of modifying Ueda's encoding method by providing Nakaya's multimedia system and a portable electronic device including a video encoder. The motivation for such a modification in Ueda is to take advantage of Art Unit: 2613

over traditional analog systems by supporting services such as video telephony and multimedia services via radio networks.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hannuksela et al. (US Patent no. 6611561) teaches video coding. Apostolopoulos et al. (US Patent no. 6404814) teaches transcoding method and transcoder for transcoding a predictively-coded object-based picture signal to a

predictively-coded block based picture signal.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gims S Philippe whose telephone number is (571) 272-7336. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30-7:00) Second Monday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris S Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/924,582 Page 6

Art Unit: 2613

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gims S Philippe Primary Examiner Art Unit 2613

GSP

April 12, 2005